

ACADEMIC SENATE BUDGET SURVEY REPORT

June 16, 2008

The Academic Senate Budget Committee conducted a survey of deans, directors and chairs during the January 4 to January 22, 2008 period. The survey form was covered with a memorandum from Michael J. McIntyre, Chair, Academic Senate Budget Committee that included the following statement:

The Budget Committee of the Academic Senate advocated using one-time funds and other budgetary changes to protect the FY 2007 and FY2008 budgets of schools and colleges. This position was taken because the percentage of the general fund allocated to schools and colleges has decreased over the past several years.

The administration implemented a policy during FY 2007 wherein accounts were frozen and staff positions eliminated. This was done in response to an anticipated budget shortfall due to the hold back of \$20 million of the FY 2007 State of Michigan appropriation. The state paid WSU the \$20 million in October 2007. The administration announced that units may spend 75% of the frozen FY2007 funds during FY2008.

Permanent reductions of \$9.1 million are in the FY 2008 budget and some units were requested to submit reduced FY2008 budgets. The request was based on an anticipated reduction in the FY2008 state appropriation; reduction in indirect cost recovery funds; decreases in tuition revenues; increases in student financial aid; and increases in the cost of utilities and faculty/staff benefits. An amount of \$1.2 million was included in the FY2008 budget for re-allocation to schools and colleges for programmatic enhancements and faculty lines.

The Budget Committee of the Academic Senate is conducting a survey to determine the impact of these budget actions on the quality of academic programs. Your response to the survey will enable the budget committee to learn the impact of reduced FY2007 and FY2008 budgets on your unit as well as obtain your unfunded budget priorities. The budget information will make it possible for the Academic Senate to advocate enhancing the quality of WSU academic programs.

One-hundred twenty-seven paper survey forms were sent to deans, directors and chairs via campus mail. The forms included a Web site link thereby providing the option of returning the paper form or completing the form online. Measures were taken to insure the anonymity of responders. There were seventeen survey forms received; nine were received via campus mail and eight via the Web site. The survey form, and tabulated results along with the responders comments, are attached as Appendices A and B, respectively.

Fifty-nine percent of the responders indicated that FY 2007 funds ranging between \$5,000 and \$817,000 were frozen. The impact on undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in the various units were: inability to purchase equipment, supplies, computers, software etc.; positions could not be filled; and travel and research funds were lost. Seventy-one percent stated that the policy on freezing funds was not easy to administer and substantial staff time, 400 hours in one case, and costs up to \$11,500 were incurred in implementing the policy. Ninety-three percent indicated that restoration of the frozen funds would restore their programs in a major way while one responder indicated "cannot repair damage already done."

Three responders indicated their FY 2008 budgets had been cut and that the effect was the loss of a GRA line, travel funds, student assistants, and possible elimination of summer activities and courses. Sixty-two percent indicated that full-time and part-time faculty and staff positions were eliminated or added in their FY 2007 and/or FY 2008 budgets. Two responders indicated the added positions would improve the quality of programs including clinical and research programs; the other responders lost positions and indicated negative impacts on teaching, faculty and student services, computer support etc. Twenty-one percent of responders reported seniority bumping resulted in decreased services because of replacement start-up time.

The manner in which the administration handled the freezing of budgets in FY 2007 and the restoration of 75% in FY 2008 was not agreeable to 62% of responders. They cited there was no prior warning; it was heavy handed and unfair; no guarantee of fund restoration below college dean level; not allowed to use grant funds or indirect accounts for necessary purchases even though general fund monies were not involved; had yet to receive any portion of the funds that were withheld; poor communications; a lot of anxiety among faculty; and wrong priorities, poor estimates, centralized control and cumbersome procedures. It was pointed out by one chair "It takes away the chair's choice/discretion on how year-end money is usually spent. You have to justify how you operate. And, it eliminates allocations of money used to enhance your department's presence at conferences."

Program enhancements were received by 44% of responders which included three replacements for professors that resigned; three new full-time faculty lines; a research enhancement grant; and a doctoral program enhancement. Twenty-five percent of responders indicated that enrollment increases impacted their ability to deliver quality academic programs because of their inability to maintain the current level of performance and attract external funding for research.

Fifty percent of responders indicated that consultation on budgetary matters was not satisfactory. Reasons given where there was no or very little discussion prior to dean-level decision, no information was given and no updates provided. One responder indicated: "We never received a final budget for 2006-07 or 2007-08." It was pointed out by another responder that "It is nearly impossible to know how much money we have at any given time. The WSU budget process is a real mess. The same goes for keeping track of money in our research accounts."

Responders suggested the Academic Senate advocate for the following to improve the quality of their programs: severe need for more GTAs; replacement of computers; restoration of associate director position; restoration of full-time secretary; restoration of twelve month budget; additional full-time and part-time faculty to maintain class sizes or reduce class sizes; full time staff person to handle research-related purchasing for college; improvement in undergraduate and graduate teaching labs because they are in short supply, inadequately maintained, dangerous, and lack modern equipment and supplies. They also commented that departments should be treated with respect and consideration; there should be open communication and sharing of information; the GTA situation is critical; computer replacements are delayed; the process by which monies are tracked is a problem both for departmental funds and research grants; work must be done to improve the amount and quality of communications from the upper administration to the departments, especially concerning budgetary issues; and that more planning would be less disruptive.

Appendix A

To: Department Chairs, Directors and Deans
From: Michael J. McIntyre, Chair, Academic Senate Budget Committee
Subject: Academic Senate Budget Committee Survey
Date: January 2, 2008

The Budget Committee of the Academic Senate advocated using one-time funds and other budgetary changes to protect the FY 2007 and FY 2008 budgets of schools and colleges. This position was taken because the percentage of the general fund allocated to schools and colleges has decreased over the past several years.

The administration implemented a policy during FY 2007 wherein accounts were frozen and staff positions eliminated. This was done in response to an anticipated budget shortfall due to the hold back of \$20 million of the FY 2007 State of Michigan appropriation. The state paid WSU the \$20 million in October 2007. The administration announced that units may spend 75% of the frozen FY 2007 funds during FY 2008.

Permanent reductions of \$9.1 million are in the FY 2008 budget and some units were requested to submit reduced FY 2008 budgets. The request was based on an anticipated reduction in the FY 2008 state appropriation; reduction in indirect cost recovery funds; decreases in tuition revenues; increases in student financial aid; and increases in the cost of utilities and faculty/staff benefits. An amount of \$1.2 million was included in the FY 2008 budget for re-allocation to schools and colleges for programmatic enhancements and faculty lines.

The Budget Committee of the Academic Senate is conducting a survey to determine the impact of these budget actions on the quality of academic programs. Your response to the survey will enable the Budget Committee to learn the impact of the FY 2007 and FY 2008 budgets on your unit as well as obtain your unfunded budget priorities. The budget information will make it possible for the Academic Senate to advocate enhancing the quality of WSU academic programs.

Please respond to the survey using the attached paper survey form **or** complete the electronic survey form at: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=KCoVhM_2fXOv3EYGthkDye1g_3d_3d

If you elect to respond electronically, consider reviewing the attached paper survey first, collect the requested budgetary information and then proceed to complete the confidential online survey.

The survey data will be processed by the Academic Senate Elections Committee to insure the anonymity of respondents.

Please complete the survey by January 11, 2008. Questions concerning the survey may be directed to the Academic Senate Office, 7-2287.

Thank you for your participation.

Academic Senate Budget Survey

Directions: Upon completing the paper survey; place the form in the survey envelope; insert the survey envelope in the return-addressed envelope; sign your name on the return-addressed envelope; and place the envelope in the campus mail. Survey items may be continued on the reverse side of this form and additional sheets may be added.

1. Were your unit's funds frozen during FY 2007?
 Yes
 No
2. If yes, what was the approximate dollar amount?
\$ _____
3. If funds were frozen, please list the budget items cut and the impact on the quality of undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit.

4. Was the policy on freezing funds and its subsequent clarification easy to administer?
 Yes
 No
5. If no, estimate the cost of staff time in dollars that was spent seeking clarifications, changes, exceptions, implementations, etc.
\$ _____
6. Will restoration of 75% of the frozen funds restore, in a major way, the impact of the funds lost in FY 2007?
 Yes
 No
7. If no, please explain the reasons.

8. Was your unit's FY 2008 budget reduced or increased?
 Yes
 No
9. If yes, please indicate the percentage and dollar amount.
Percentage (%) _____
Amount (\$) _____
10. List the items that were cut or added and explain the impact on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit.

11. Were part-time and/or full-time staff and faculty positions eliminated or added in your FY 2007 and/or FY 2008 budgets?
 Yes
 No
12. If yes, how many part-time and full-time staff?
Number of part-time staff _____
Number of full-time staff _____
13. If yes, how many part-time and full-time faculty?
Number of part-time faculty _____
Number of full-time faculty _____

14. If yes to item 11, what is the impact on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit?

15. Was there seniority bumping of unionized support staff?

- Yes
- No

16. If yes, how many?

Number _____

17. If yes, what is the impact of seniority bumping on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit?

18. Do you agree with the manner in which the administration handled the budget (freezing budgets in FY 2007, restoring 75% of funds in FY 2008, etc.) as a result of the hold back of \$20 million of the FY 2007 state appropriations?

- Yes
- No

19. If no, please explain the reasons.

20. Did your unit receive FY 2008 programmatic enhancements and/or new faculty positions?

- Yes
- No

21. If yes, please briefly describe the programmatic enhancements and/or faculty positions?

22. Have enrollment increases impacted the ability of your unit to deliver quality academic programs?

- Yes
- No

23. If yes, please explain the impact on undergraduate and graduate programs.

24. Has consultation on budgetary matters been satisfactory?

- Yes
- No

25. If no, please explain the reasons.

26. Please list and explain the unfunded programmatic priorities that would increase the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit.

27. Please provide additional comments that you feel will be useful to the Academic Senate in advocating for the enhancement of quality academic programs.

Appendix B

Tabulated Survey Results

Please read these notes before viewing the tabulated survey results.

1. 127 paper survey forms with the link to the Web site with the electronic survey form were sent to deans, directors and chairs on January 4, 2008.
2. 127 E-mail reminders with the Web site link were sent on January 9, 2008.
3. Nine paper survey forms were received as of January 29, 2008.
4. Eight electronic forms were received as of January 22, 2008.
5. In order to protect the anonymity of responders:
 - a. the signed envelopes containing paper survey forms were opened and disposed of prior to compiling the responses, and
 - b. the IP addresses were deleted from the electronic survey forms prior to compiling the responses.
6. Numbers 1 through 17, referred to as responder numbers, were assigned to forms in order to facilitate correlation of responses.
7. The numbers before the Yes and No items are the number of responses and the percentages. Following the Yes and No items, and on the same line, are responder numbers.
8. The responder numbers precede data and comments for the open-ended questions.
9. Dollar amounts are given in \$1,000.
10. Some responders did answer all the questions, and some paper form responders wrote comments after Yes and No items; the written comments are listed below the Yes and No items.

Academic Senate Paper Budget Survey Results

28. Were your unit's funds frozen during FY 2007?
10 (59%) Yes 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17
7 (41%) No 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15
29. If yes, what was the approximate dollar amount?
Amount in \$1,000: 1- 5+; 3-15; 4-15; 7-55, 8-817, 9-5, 10-100, 13-484, 16-10, 17-11.5
30. If funds were frozen, please list the budget items cut and the impact on the quality of undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit.
 - 1-Equipment and supplies-negative impact
 - 3-New computers for faculty; software for faculty; and supplies
 - 4-Purchasing equipment and supplies; travel; and research support
 - 7-Personnel placements on GF not allowed
 - 8-The burden shifted to the clinical practices, making their situation even more difficult.
 - 9-Travel funds to conferences were eliminated.
 - 10-office equipment replacement, computer replacement, lost research seed monies, lost non-rep research position, lost secretary
 - 13-copiers, computers, lab equipment, all which hampered effective instruction
 - 16-office supplies and computers; equipment and staff for research lab; and lack of computers severely hampered operations in delivering services in our program unit
 - 17-travel paperwork returned continually
31. Was the policy on freezing funds and its subsequent clarification easy to administer?
4 (29%) Yes 3, 7, 9, 14
10 (71%) No 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17
6-Didn't know they were frozen, but don't think they were
32. If no, estimate the cost of staff time in dollars that was spent seeking clarifications, changes, exceptions, implementations, etc.
Amount in \$1,000: 1-5; 4-1; 7-3
7-seeking exceptions
8-Don't know
10-400 hours
11-Impossible to determine. We really have no way to estimate this.
13-one weeks pay for a secretary
15-immense

- 16-unable to calculate the readjusts, revamped plans and man hours involved
17 priceless
33. Will restoration of 75% of the frozen funds restore, in a major way, the impact of the funds lost in FY 2007?
13 (93%) Yes 6, 4-If received by this unit; 6-I guess but I haven't really noticed any impact; 7
1 (7%) No
7. If no, please explain the reasons.
1-Cannot repair damage already done
8. Was your unit's FY 2008 budget reduced or increased?
4 (33%) Yes 2, 4, 7,9
10 (67%) No 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
1-Don't know – Dean has not released numbers
6-Stayed the same
9. If yes, please indicate the percentage and dollar amount.
Percentage (%) 2-10, 4-25, 7-<1, 9-1
Amount in k\$ 2-3, 4-35, 7-5, 9-475
10. List the items that were cut or added and explain the impact on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit. __
2-Some travel and student assistants to assist with office duties
4-Possible elimination of all summer activities and courses
7-GRA line
14-none
15-Administrative, Faculty, Support, Student Services
11. Were part-time and/or full-time staff and faculty positions eliminated or added in your FY 2007 and/or FY 2008 budgets?
10 (62%) Yes 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16
6 (38%) No 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 17
1-Unknown
12. If yes, how many part-time and full-time staff?
Number of part-time staff 6-1, 7-3, 9-1, 10-1, 14-7, 16-1
Number of full-time staff 4-1, 5-1, 9-1, 10-1, 15-7, 16-2
13. If yes, how many part-time and full-time faculty?
Number of part-time faculty 6-2, 15-5,
Number of full-time faculty 5-1, 6-3, 8-1, 15-2, 16-2
14. If yes to item 11, what is the impact on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit?
4-Secretarial services reduced by 1/3, loss of day's service (processing, reception, etc.)
5-We have not been allowed to refill a position following a retirement. This has a serious impact on our ability to staff our teaching program. We are dependent on maintaining a steady-state level of faculty to keep up our strength in research. If we are not allowed to fill vacancies, the department will become weaker and eventually evaporate.
6-Improved the quality
7-Minor
8-Improved clinical and research programs. The NEW faculty member was hired to enhance our stroke services.
9-Our computer technician position was eliminated. This person was responsible for maintaining the department's website, network server, and 15 computer workstations lab.
10-loss of secretarial support for a semester degraded quality for support for undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs
13-secretarial cut impacted programs by having fewer staff to service students and faculty needs
15-Highly negative
15. Was there seniority bumping of unionized support staff?
3 (21%) Yes 1, 11, 13
13 (79%) No 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17
16. If yes, how many?
1-1, 11-1, 13-1, 15-2
17. If yes, what is the impact of seniority bumping on the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit?

- 1-Negative effect on residency program
 11-I lost the best secretary I ever had. Everyone was very upset when she had to leave. Although her replacement is very good, there was a very real and negative impact on our operations.
 13-start-up time to get new staff oriented took over one month and occupied another staff member's time leading to decreased service to students and faculty
18. Do you agree with the manner in which the administration handled the budget (freezing budgets in FY 2007, restoring 75% of funds in FY 2008, etc.) as a result of the hold back of \$20 million of the FY 2007 state appropriations?
 4 (38%) Yes 3, 8, 13, 14
 8 (62%) No 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17
 1-neutral
19. If no, please explain the reasons.
 1-No prior warning; heavy handed and unfair
 4-No guarantee of fund restoration below college dean level
 5-We were not allowed to use grant funds or indirect accounts for necessary purchases even though General Fund monies were not involved. This does not make sense.
 6-No opinion as I did not see any impact.
 7-Not sure
 9-We have yet to receive any portion of the funds that were withheld.
 11-Poor communications is my main complaint. We really did not know what was going on. Neither were we told when the State gave us back the \$20M. Why can't these simple things be told to us?
 12-Basically, the news of deficit and freezing funds caused a lot of anxiety among faculty.
 15-Wrong priorities, poor estimates, centralized control, cumbersome procedures
 17-It takes away the chair's choice/discretion on how year-end money is usually spent. You have to justify how you operate. An, it eliminates allocations of money use to enhance your department's presence at conferences.
20. Did your unit receive FY 2008 programmatic enhancements and/or new faculty positions?
 7 (44%) Yes 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 17
 9 (56%) No 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16
 1-Don't know
21. If yes, please briefly describe the programmatic enhancements and/or faculty positions?
 2-Replacement for resignation of professor
 3-Assistant professor to replace open line vacated by retirement
 6-One additional full-time faculty
 9-We received two full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty positions
 10-graduate research enhancement grant
 12-doctoral enhancement
 17-replacement of tenure-track position vacated by resignation
22. Have enrollment increases impacted the ability of your unit to deliver quality academic programs?
 4 (25%) Yes 1, 5, 6, 11
 12 (75%) No 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17
23. If yes, please explain the impact on undergraduate and graduate programs.
 1-Additional medical students, inconsistent distribution throughout year
 5-Staff reductions concomitant with enrollment increases erodes our ability to maintain our current level of performance, never mind improve.
 6-Number of students in major at both undergraduate and graduate levels increasing faster than adding faculty
 11-Our undergraduate enrollments are increasing rapidly - up over 60% in the past 6 years. During this time our budgets have been cut. The combination of these issues has made it extremely difficult to meet all the needs of our students. It has also meant that our faculty is spending more time teaching, which leaves less time available for writing grant applications and papers. This is having a negative effect on our ability to attract external funding.
24. Has consultation on budgetary matters been satisfactory?
 8 (50%) Yes 3, 7, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17
 8 (50%) No 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11
25. If no, please explain the reasons.
 1-No discussion; no updates; no info given

- 2-Very little discussion with DO
 - 4-Absolutely no consultation prior to dean's level decisions.
 - 5-There was no consultation.
 - 8-We never received a final budget for 2006-07 or 2007-08.
 - 9-There is very little communication on budgetary matters coming from our dean's office.
 - 11-It is nearly impossible to know how much money we have at any given time. The WSU budget process is a real mess. The same goes for keeping track of money in our research accounts.
 - 6-Don't recall any consultation.
26. Please list and explain the unfunded programmatic priorities that would increase the quality of the undergraduate, graduate, research and service programs in your unit.
- 3-Severe need for more GTAs. Old computers have not been replaced.
 - 4- Restoration of associate director position for community & grant development; restoration of full-time secretarial; restoration of 12 mo. Budget
 - 6-Additional full-time and part-time faculty to maintain class sizes or reduce class sizes
 - 10-need full time staff person to handle research-related purchasing for college
 - 11-Undergraduate teaching labs are in short supply. The ones we have are inadequately maintained. Some are dangerous (e.g. Shapero Hall). Some labs lack modern equipment and supplies. These problems are echoed in our graduate programs.
 - 17-Brochures, designated money for student organizations, limitations on travel, and having to use ICR money to offset faculty expenditures.
27. Please provide additional comments that you feel will be useful to the Academic Senate in advocating for the enhancement of quality academic programs.
- 1-Treat departments with respect & consideration. Provide open communication and share information.
 - 3-The GTA situation is critical. Computer replacement delayed.
 - 11-Please fix the process by which money is tracked, both for departments and for research grants. Also, please work on improving the amount and quality of communications from the upper administration to the departments, especially concerning budgetary issues.
 - 14-Comment: Our unit is completely grant funded and therefore was not affected by the budget freeze. Most of our services do not directly extend to students as our unit provides software applications for libraries at other institutions.
 - 16-More planning would be less disruptive.